

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-55 are pending in this application. By this amendment, the title of the application is amended to be more descriptive, claims 1, 3, 5, 11, 13, 21, 22, 28, 30 and 38-45 are amended and claims 46-55 are added. Support for the amendments and added claims can be found in at least paragraphs [0073]-[0090] and Figure 3 of the application. No new matter is added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims at least in view of the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 42-44 under 35 U.S.C. §101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action states "a computer program product" can be read as any product that contains software codes. Applicant amends claims 42-44 to replace "A computer program product" with "A computer-readable medium that stores a program." Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8, 10-15, 20, 39, 42 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0084086 (Simpson). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Simpson does not disclose "a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received during the monitoring period," as recited in claim 1. Rather, Simpson discloses a system that monitors start time conflicts, by which the start time for a processing job of a second user is compared to start times of processing jobs previously reserved, and determines whether a conflict exists (Simpson [0076]). "[A] conflict exists for the requested start time [if the] production device 201 [is] already reserved, [the] start time [is] administratively 'blacked out' to reservations or otherwise not available for the requested start time" (Simpson [0076]). Simpson fails to disclose "a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received" because the system in Simpson

only monitors for subsequent start times and fails to disclose monitoring for modifications of the operational parameters. The system disclosed in Simpson does not allow a second user's processing request if the request has a start time that conflicts with a first user's processing request, even if the operational parameters of the two requests are identical. However, because claim 1 recites "a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received during the monitoring period," the claimed system would allow a second user's processing request that has a start time that conflicts with a first user's processing request if the operational parameters do not conflict.

In addition, the processing time in Simpson is not controlled or determined by the user. While the user can request a future start time at which the processing time begins, the processing time ultimately is determined by the system, as indicated in Figure 2B of Simpson. In Block 227, the system of Simpson analyzes the processing job and calculates how much time is required to complete the job, i.e., the processing time (Simpson [0074], [0075]). The system then automatically blocks out the calculated processing time required to finish the processing job. However, the "monitoring period" recited in claim 1 is determined "with respect to operational parameters set by a first user" and is therefore not calculated by the system. This affords the user greater control over the operational parameters of the electronic device beyond the time required to complete a single processing request and evidences the difference between the recited operational parameters and the processing job disclosed in Simpson. Therefore, Simpson fails to disclose claim 1, and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1..

Claims 2-8, 10-15, 20 and 38 depend from claim 1 and are therefore also patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons enumerated above, as well as for the

additional features they recite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 2-8, 10-15, 20 and 38.

Claims 39 and 42 recite "monitoring period" and "a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received." Claim 45 recites "a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters received from a second user." These features are not disclosed in the Simpson reference for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. For at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claims 39, 42 and 45.

The Office Action rejects claims 21-25, 27-32, 37, 40 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Simpson. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 21, 40 and 43 recite "a number of execution determining system that determines the number of times of operations to be executed by said electronic device in accordance with operational parameters set by a first user independent from the first user issuing a processing request." The above feature of claims 21, 40 and 43 allow a user to control the electronic device independent from a processing request. Simpson fails to disclose this feature because the start time of a processing job as recited in Simpson is dependent on issuing a processing request. The user in Simpson must make a processing request in order to enter a start time to black out the electronic device. Therefore the Office Action's allegation that issuing a processing request with various printer settings discloses the above recitation is incorrect because changing the various printer settings depends on issuing the processing request. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21, 40 and 43.

The Office Action rejects claims 16-19 and 33-36 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson in view of Official Notice supported by U.S. Patent No. 5,547,178

(Costello) and rejects claims 9 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0161740 (Nakamura).

Applicant respectfully traverses the assertion of Official Notice and the rejections.

These rejections are premised upon the presumption that Simpson discloses all of the features of claims 1 and 21. Because, as discussed above, Simpson does not disclose all of the features of claims 1 and 21, the rejections are improper. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections.

The Office Action rejects claims 41 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simpson in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0039779 (Amstrong). Specifically, the Office Action states that it would have been obvious for someone skilled in the art to modify Simpson to allow users to input customized messages, as disclosed in Armstrong, instead of using default messages (Office Action page 14). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Simpson and Armstrong does not disclose or suggest "a modifying system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with a request for modification of the operational parameters requested by a terminal device independent from a processing request," as recited in claims 41 and 44. Simpson discloses monitoring only for subsequent processing requests, as discussed above. Because Simpson discloses only monitoring for subsequent processing requests, it does not perform monitoring independent from receiving subsequent processing requests. Inherently tied to this is that Simpson fails to disclose modifying operational parameters independent from a user making a processing request. The Office Action alleges that a second user's request to print with second settings other than a first user's settings discloses claims 41 and 44 (Office Action page 14). However, a second user's request to print with second settings is directly dependent on the second user making a processing request after the first user makes a processing request. Thus, Simpson fails to

disclose modifying "the operational parameters in accordance with a request for modification of the operational parameters requested by a terminal device independent from a processing request," as recited in claims 41 and 44. Importantly, the Office Action does not allege nor does Simpson in view of Armstrong cure this deficiency because Armstrong only discloses using customizable messages. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Regarding dependent claims 46–55, these claims are patentable in view of their various dependencies on patentable independent claims, as discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Furthermore, the applied references fail to disclose both functional parameters and protection parameters, with the protection parameters "entered . . . independent from a processing request," as recited in claims 46–55.


Specifically regarding claims 46 and 52, the Office Action asserts on page 3 that the "processing time," disclosed in Simpson, is equivalent to the "monitoring period," recited in claim 1 and similarly recited in claims 46 and 52. Applicant submits this interpretation is incorrect. The processing time in Simpson is the time required to complete one processing job requested by a user for a production device and is dependent on the user making a processing request (Simpson ¶¶ [0074], [0075]). The processing time ends when the processing job has completed (Simpson ¶ [0076]). Importantly, Simpson fails to disclose "a monitoring period" that is determined "with respect to the protection parameters set by a first user" where the protection parameters "are parameters entered by the first user, independent from a processing request, to control the modification of the functional parameters" because the monitoring period is independent from a user making a processing request, and is therefore independent of the processing time to complete a processing request. This allows a user to control an electronic device without having to continuously request processing jobs.

Regarding claims 51 and 54, the applied references do not disclose or suggest "a modifying system that modifies the functional parameters and protection parameters in accordance with a request for modification of the functional parameters and protection parameters requested by a terminal device," as recited in claims 51 and 54. As stated above, Simpson does not disclose "protection parameters [that] are entered by a first user, independent from a processing request," nor allowing a user to modify protection parameters. Combining Simpson with Armstrong does not overcome this deficiency as Armstrong only teaches having customizable messages, as alleged in the Office Action. Therefore, Applicant asserts that claims 51 and 54 are patentable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-55 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Jesse O. Collier  
Registration No. 53,839

JAO:KRG/jnm

Attachment:  
Amendment Transmittal  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 23, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---